



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/075,795 | 02/13/2002 | Donald W. Bryan | T9742 | 9196 |
| 20449 | 7590 | 03/17/2009 | EXAMINER | |
| KARL R CANNON PO BOX 1909 SANDY, UT 84091 | | | COMSTOCK, DAVID C | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | | |
| | 3733 | | | |
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | | | |
| 03/17/2009 | PAPER | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/075,795

Examiner

DAVID COMSTOCK

Applicant(s)

BRYAN, DONALD W.

Art Unit

3733

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 09 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 144-159.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 144-159.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-19 and 192.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 20-26.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

/Eduardo C. Robert/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3733

/David Comstock/
 Examiner, Art Unit 3733

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In response to Applicant's comments regarding the filing fees paid to the Office, Examiner acknowledges the payment of these fees by Applicant but respectfully emphasizes that allowability can be based only on the merits of the claims, and not the amount of fees paid. Examiner further acknowledges that 43 claims remain pending and notes that Applicant canceled the other claims.

Applicant's arguments on pages 20 and 21 of the response are persuasive for the reasons set forth therein. Accordingly, claims 144-152 would be allowed and withdrawn claims 153-159 would be rejoined and allowed.

Applicant's arguments pertaining to independent claim 1 have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Applicant asserts that one noted difference between the references is evidence they are not capable of being combined and that the references teach away from the suggested combination. However, that the references may differ in one respect is not conclusive evidence that they are not compatible. Examiner does not agree that there would necessarily be two screws in the device of the combination of Brace et al. and Heinig et al. Rather, since it has been held that a person of ordinary skill in the art is not an automaton, such a person could readily appreciate the advantage of combining the references in the way and for the reasons set forth in the rejection. Specifically, Brace et al. could easily be made to exclusively or further utilize a clamping configuration as clearly shown in Heinig et al. The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

In response to Applicant's request for Examiner to separately consider the dependent claims (2-19 and 192), it is noted that Applicant has not presented any reasoned arguments with respect to the rejection of these claims. Therefore, there is nothing to separately consider. Accordingly, the reply fails to satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.111 with respect to the dependent claims for which Applicant requests separate consideration.